



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,829	08/31/2001	Gary Ditlow	BUR9-2000-0146-US1	2812
21254	7590	04/19/2005	EXAMINER	
MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 200 VIENNA, VA 22182-3817			TANG, KENNETH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2195	

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/943,829		DITLOW ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Kenneth Tang		2195	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                         |                                                                             |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                                |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                             | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

*Handwritten mark*

Art Unit: 2195

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to the Amendment filed on 1/4/05. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but were not found to be persuasive.
2. Claims 1-19 are presented for examination.

### ***Specification***

3. Applicant is required to update the current status of the cross-reference to related applications in the introductory paragraph of the specification with the application number or patent number, if issued.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. **Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-8, 10-11, 13-14, 16-17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertazzi et al. (hereinafter Robertazzi) (US 6,370,560 B1) in view of Kimmel et al. (hereinafter Kimmel) (US 6,105,053).**

2. As to claim 1, Robertazzi teaches a method determining a listing of host processors on a network to perform a parallel application, comprising:

determining for each of said possible host a current capacity and a current

Art Unit: 2195

utilization (*col. 6, lines 20-33, col. 2, lines 55-66, col. 3, lines 1-12*);

calculating for each of said possible host a difference (the segment portion of the load that is available to process) between said current capacity and said current utilization (*col. 6, lines 20-33, col. 2, lines 55-66, col. 3, lines 1-12*); and

sorting (by priority) said calculated differences (the segment portion of the load that is available to process) (*col. 1, lines 21-33, col. 6, lines 20-33*).

3. Robertazzi fails to explicitly teach determining and using a listing of all possible hosts on the network for performing the parallel application (*see Abstract*). However, Kimmel teaches a multiprocessing system having a listing in the form of a hierarchical tree structure that represents all the job processors in the network that can be used. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature of having the listing of all possible hosts on the network for performing the parallel applications to the existing system because this increases the efficiency level of affinity and this helps to maintain balanced processor and memory loads (*see Abstract*).

4. As to claim 2, Robertazzi teaches wherein said determination of a listing of processors is itself a parallel processing application (*col. 1, lines 21-33*).

5. As to claim 4, Robertazzi inherently teaches providing said selected listing of hosts to an operating system controlling an execution of said parallel application because it is inherent that the computer processor has an operating system that gives the instructions for task management and parallel processing.

Art Unit: 2195

6. As to claim 5, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Robertazzi teaches the job queue or list containing quantification data but fails to explicitly teach it containing a history. However, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing that lists containing history information is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include lists containing history information to the existing system because this increase functionality and sophistication of the system if processes are executed based on the history.

7. As to claim 7, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 1 and 4.

8. As to claim 8, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 2.

9. As to claim 10, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 4.

10. As to claim 11, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 5.

11. As to claim 13, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 1 and 4.

Art Unit: 2195

12. As to claim 14, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 2.

13. As to claim 16, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 4.

14. As to claim 17, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 5.

15. As to claim 19, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1.

**16. Claims 3, 9, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertazzi et al. (hereinafter Robertazzi) (US 6,370,560 B1) in view of Kimmel et al. (hereinafter Kimmel) (US 6,105,053), and further in view of Hoffberg et al. (hereinafter Hoffberg) (US 6,400,996 B1).**

17. As to claim 3, Robertazzi teaches wherein said determination of a listing of processors is executed in parallel (see the rejection of claim 1) but fails to explicitly teach real-time processing. However, Hoffberg teaches parallel processing in real-time provides the advantage of eliminating delays associated with the implementation of complex calculations on general purpose computing devices (*col. 86, lines 26-33*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature of real-time processing to the existing system in order to gain the advantages real-time processing described above.

Art Unit: 2195

18. As to claim 9, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 3.

19. As to claim 15, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 3.

20. **Claims 6, 12, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertazzi et al. (hereinafter Robertazzi) (US 6,370,560 B1) in view of Kimmel et al. (hereinafter Kimmel) (US 6,105,053), and further in view of Hirata et al. (hereinafter Hirata) (US 2001/0054094 A1).**

21. As to claim 6, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1. However, Robertazzi in view of Kimmel fails to explicitly teach normalizing. Hirata teaches normalizing as an advantage to convert to a standard and common format. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature of normalizing to gain the advantage described above.

22. As to claim 12, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 6.

23. As to claim 18, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 6.

***Response to Arguments***

Art Unit: 2195

24. *Applicant argues on pages 10 and 11 that Robertazzi does not teach or suggest the determination of the current capacity and current utilization of each host and calculate the difference between the two.*

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The current capacity is the cost. The current utilization is how many segments of the divisible load. The difference between the current capacity and the current utilization is merely the segment portion of the load that is available to process (*see Abstract and col. 6, lines 15-36*).

25. *Applicant argues on page 11 that it is an improper motivation to modify the Robertazzi with Kimmel because they don't solve the same or reasonably related problem.*

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Robertazzi and Kimmel are in the same field of endeavor. Robertazzi teaches listing of host processors on a tree network for load balancing. Kimmel teaches listing of host processors on a tree network for load balancing.

26. *Applicant argues on pages 11 that even if the references were considered combinable, the basic deficiency would not be overcome.*

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant provides not support for this argument, therefore, it is not found to be persuasive. Kimmel teaches a multiprocessing system having a listing in the form of a hierarchical tree structure that represents all the job processors in the network that can be used (*see Abstract*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature of having the listing of all possible hosts on the network for performing the parallel applications to the existing system because this increases the efficiency level of affinity and this helps to maintain balanced processor and memory loads (*see Abstract*).



27. *Applicant argues on page 12 that a modification to Robertazzi to remedy the deficiency would change the principle of operation for that reference.*

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant provides no support for this argument and it is not understood by the Examiner how it would change the operation.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth Tang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3772. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 6:00PM, Every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2195

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kt  
5/15/05



LEWIS A. BULLOCK, JR.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER